

Date: Tue, 30 Nov 93 04:30:11 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #498
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 30 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 498

Today's Topics:

 14313 KHz
 No Code etc... (2 msgs)
 THE argument for CW requirements (was:
 Use of HT for Marine & GMRS (2 msgs)
 Why this newsgroup is like CB

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 29 Nov 1993 21:28:44 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!
hpubmaa.esr.hp.com!garhow@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 14313 KHz
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2ddj5sINNgua@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)
writes:

|> Well, I doubt that it takes up more than 1-2 KHz of the entire band,
|> and I can stand that. A handful of jerks doesn't condemn ham radio
|> out of hand.

Granted that for the time being this seems to be restricted to this
frequency and is not spread across the bands. It's just that having been
involved in Amateur Radio for a number of years I still see this as a
degradation. Twenty years ago this would not have been tolerated even if
anyone chose to behave this way. Will it still be restricted to these few

frequencies five years from now?

|>
|> It would have been more relaxing to tune down to the cw parts of
|> the bands this weekend and listened to some of the international
|> contest that was going on. Lots of activity, and I didn't hear
|> a single rude word, frequency fight or jammer all weekend.
|>

Actually, this is where I spend most of my time. I work CW more than SSB for several reasons, including low power and limited antenna, but mainly because I enjoy it and find it fun. At the same time I am not trying to force it on anyone if they don't enjoy it.

|> So while there may be no difference between 14313 and CB, there
|> are differences elsewhere.
|>

Agreed. I am not trying to condemn the entire Amateur Service because of a handful of jerks, but at the same time I see this as an alarming trend.

|> >>Many of the people on this frequency have Extra class calls.
|>
|> Do people use callsigns there? - it's been months since I tuned
|> that high in the band and I never heard a callsign given there.
|>
|> And how can you be sure that they are not lowlier license class
|> holders, or even unlicensed people, using Extra class callsigns?
|> You can use anyone's callsign if you are lawless.
|>

Some were giving callsigns but who knows?

|> If there are 10 people on 14313, there are over 600,000 hams
|> who are NOT there at the same time. All this stuff that others
|> spout about proving that cw is not a filter is based on shaky
|> statistics. You may as well say that the driving test is not
|> useful since the worst drivers on the road have passed the test.
|> And remember that 33% of all surgeons graduated in the lowest
|> third of their classes...
|>

Sure CW is a filter, but so is the written exam even though I understand that it is somewhat easier these days. The question is what kind of filter? I think the evidence is just as shaky that lack of a CW requirement lets in poor operators.

|> Some Extra class hams are jerks, of course. It doesn't mean
|> that they all are. If you listen in the first 25 KHz of the
|> cw bands you will hear lots of Extras who are not jerks. If
|> you listen in other places you will hear plenty of people who
|> are not jerks, of all license classes.
|>
|> If the stuff on 14313 bothers you, just tune somewhere else.
|> If this stuff were spread all over all of our bands, then I'd
|> agree that we had a major problem. It's an annoyance, but if
|> there is a National Jerk Frequency it's fine with me, at least
|> they stay in one place.
|>

Let's just hope they continue to stay in one place.

Garry
KE0SH

--

Garry Howard	Hewlett-Packard Company
Technical Consultant	29 Burlington Mall Road
Professional Services Organization	Burlington, MA 01803 USA
garhow@hpubmaa.esr.hp.com	

[I do not speak for HP officially or otherwise.]

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 93 17:28:54 EST
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Code etc...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Is it polite to force the other users to download all that old text before they
can see your reply?

BTW, Delphi has TWO newsreaders -- one called NN, and a new one. I gave up on
NN (which allows replies to be added to a message) because its VT100-based
commands didn't work worth a darn over the (commercial) packet network. The
new one, which Delphi apparently did in-house, works a lot like Delphi's own
forums do -- you can type PREV to see the message being replied to. Once again,
I shouldn't have to spew out somebody else's text because other newsreaders are
poorly designed.

Date: 23 Nov 1993 13:15:05 CST

From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!maccvm.corp.mot.com!CSLE87@uunet.uu.net
Subject: No Code etc...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

WAIT A MINUTE!! I for one do NOT want to become the minority when you start counting the 27 MHz (+/-) CB boys as hams. I would rather remain part of a much smaller select group who have demonstrated their skills in electronics theory, rule compliance, and communications ability, and even that dreaded enemy of the common man MORSE CODE!

Besides, you'll have to not count them, since the FCC stopped issuing CB licenses years ago and they have no idea how many folks currently occupy that chunk of the spectrum. It would be interesting to see how many folks admitted to using the 40 legal channels as compared to the remainder, if you could justify taking a survey without jeopardy.

----- Original Article -----

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Path: schbbs!mothost!binford!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!asuvax!cs.utexas.edu!uunet!brun
From: md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan)
Subject: Re: No Code etc...
Message-ID: <1993Nov23.142723.23033@cs.brown.edu>
Sender: news@cs.brown.edu
Organization: Brown University Department of Computer Science
References: <1993Nov20.184041.13921@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1993 14:27:23 GMT
Lines: 31

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> Yes, at least until we change our treaty arrangements either by taking
> an exception as the Japanese did, or at the next competent WARC.

You know, I've always wondered why people against a code requirement always like to point to the Japanese with their "no code" HF license.

When you actually look at the Japanese no-code HF license, it is basically the same as CB radio in the US. Limited power, limited distance on HF (something like 5 or 10 watts and a 250 mile distance limitation). CB radio may be a little more restrictive, but its basically the same thing.

So, the next time someone attempts to use the Japanese HF argument, claiming that the Japanese have millions of amateur operators because of it, just remember:

1. Our "no code" HF license came long before the Japanese's did , and
2. If we counted all of the current CB users as "amateurs", we'd have a hell of a lot more "amateurs" than Japan does.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: 23 Nov 93 16:39:11 EST
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!udel!news.intercon.com!
psinntp!arrl.org@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was:
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:
>mode. (No surprise, eh?) But what I want to address here is slightly
>different. Dan says nothing exceeds the human ear's ability to recognize
>patterns buried in noise. Leaving aside mechanical DSP and other encodings
>such as PSK which track better because they *aren't* on/off keyed and
>allow coherent detection, there is another *human* system that has better
>pattern extraction capability than the human auditory system. That's the
>human visual system. Physiologists tell us that the human visual system

Good point. I should have mentioned that in the AMSAT article I
mentioned earlier, the author used a visual spectral display to
find a weak Morse signal that he couldn't even detect by ear.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1993 12:31:38 -0700
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_13059.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <holland-231193103417@beagley.dom.uab.edu>,
holland@gasmac.dom.uab.edu (Steve Holland) wrote:

> I think that in the regs for each service, other than the amateur
> service, it is required that the equipment used be type certified
> for use in that service. I wonder is some of the radios we use

> are type certified in multiple services and just packaged and
> labelled differently. I had asked a local radio company about use
> of my 440 HT for GMRS use and he told me it would be illegal and
> he wanted to sell me a \$600 radio that was GMRS type certified.

Not only is that done, most of the commercial radios have counterparts in ham rigs! The major difference is usually the ham rig having many more functions.

Even so, I am unaware of any commercial radio being type accepted for more than one service such as GMRS and Marine, even if the only difference is the front panel!

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BOBS BEST BENT WIRE SK

Date: 23 Nov 1993 13:24:47 CST
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!maccvm.corp.mot.com!CSLE87@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Steve - Given the cost of type acceptance and the obvious marketing advantages that would result if radios were type-accepted, you can bet the farm that if your amateur radio was FCC type-accepted it would be so labeled. In fact, that's a requirement of type acceptance procedure. Every US manufacturer that I know does get TA for as many services as possible on every model, so they can write off the development and TA across as many unit sales as possible. The simple fact is that hams won't pay commercial prices for commercial quality equipment; it has been proven many times with many manufacturers and products. We always say "I could build that myself for one fourth the price," but you know how few hams actually build anything themselves any more.

I do applaud your dealer for at least trying to maintain some level of technical standards on the bands. Dealers themselves do not pay the penalties when someone uses an illegal radio commercially, the user pays and the dealer escapes by pleading that he didn't know the guy did not have a license, or didn't tell him how the radios would be used. There is precious little integrity left in the radio sales business, so you should thank your dealer for protecting you from being cited by the FCC!

----- Original Article -----

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
From: holland@gasmac.dom.uab.edu (Steve Holland)
Subject: Re: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
Message-ID: <holland-231193103417@beagley.dom.uab.edu>

References: <93326.174137MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU>

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1993 16:34:13 GMT

In article <93326.174137MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU>,
<MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU> wrote:

>

> I have seen various discussions about using the out of band frequencies
> on a Amateur band transceiver for Marine, GMRS or other services.
> If a person is an Amateur, and also holds licenses for other services
> can he/she use their amateur radio on those services. Is there a
> definitive authority or regulation cite which can be found to make
> such a determination ?

I think that in the regs for each service, other than the amateur service, it is required that the equipment used be type certified for use in that service. I wonder if some of the radios we use are type certified in multiple services and just packaged and labelled differently. I had asked a local radio company about use of my 440 HT for GMRS use and he told me it would be illegal and he wanted to sell me a \$600 radio that was GMRS type certified.

Steve Holland, KD4TTC

Date: 23 Nov 1993 21:41:41 GMT

From: news.mentorg.com!hpcan240.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Why this newsgroup is like CB

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <199311220349.TAA05460@ucsd.edu>,

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

|> >I always wanted to yell "THEATER" in a crowded fire house...

|>

|> you can when there is a fire. maybe you can talk the local projectionist to
|> get some nitrate based film to show...(if there's any still around).

|>

|> bill

And yet more proof that most of the folks who post here probably did not make it through 4th grade.

I kinda thought "ability to read simple english" was a license requirement. Now I know it is not.

... Hank

--

My opinions, not Mentor's.

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.0R.USA.NA

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1993 20:14:32 GMT
From: qualcomm.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!
gatekeeper.es.dupont.com!esds01.es.dupont.com!
COLLINST%esvx19.es.dupont.com@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <B1mRDc1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
<1993Nov29.000300.26536@icaen.uiowa.edu>,
<CH9K86.Fnx@freenet.carleton.ca>,<2dddto\$g07@hpscit.sc.hp.com>LLINST
Reply-To : collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com
Subject : Re: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

In article <2dddto\$g07@hpscit.sc.hp.com>, garhow@hpubmaa.esr.HP.COM (Garry Howard)
writes:

>I heard about some of the goings on on 14.313 but never listened until
>this weekend. Just monitor this frequency for a while and you will
>discover there is absolutely no difference between CB and ham radio.
>The behaviour on this frequency is probably worse than most CBers. I have
>been a ham for thirty years with some long lapses of inactivity. I am
>just now getting back on the air after almost ten years away from HF.
>This kind of activity is a sad commentary on the current state of the
>hobby. And there is one thing for sure, there are no no-code Techs involved
>in this. Many of the people on this frequency have Extra class calls.
>

I'm not going to defend the activity on .313 at all. The ops there
are a bunch of assholes who were assholes before they ever got
their license's. I don't get how they can be WORSE than most
CBers, equal to, yes....but neither group has any business with
any kind of radio gear (maybe a common sense test needs to be added
by the FCC?) 8-}

Also, monitor the frequency for a period (weeks) of time. I have
on and off over the last couple of years and you'll find like I did
that there are about 20 hams who are doing this junk. But IMHO,
the whole Amateur Radio Community shouldn't be condemned because
of this minority.

And last, the main reason for my reply.....you saying there are no "NO-CODER" TECHS involved in this activity. This is a STRAWMAN, as no coders aren't allowed on this band in the first place are they? I don't know if you brought up this point as support for opening up the HF band to one and all or not, but thats what I have read-between -the-lines in your message. And by the way, how do you know who is doing the Cat Calling, Noise Making, Jamming etc. when they don't give their callsigns?

Just because I have heard a "NO-CODE" Tech on 26.800 doesn't mean that all of them are law-breakers.....just him....

73, Tom WI3P collinst@esvax.dnet.dupont.com or collinst@world.std.com

"Shutup and sit down you moron!"...Ben Stern

*** MY EMPLOYER DOESN'T SPEAK FOR ME NOR I FOR THEM ***

Date: Tue, 23 Nov 93 17:23:26 EST
From: news.centerline.com!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ykLeDc1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <931122.79659.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CGxJrE.JH3@news.Hawaii.Edu>s.d
Subject : Re: No Code etc...

Why should an examinee have to know how to draw a schematic, from memory, of a particular circuit? He may never actually USE such a circuit, and even if he does he won't have to know how to draw the diagram in order to use it well (or even to repair it using the designers' documentation).

Date: 30 Nov 93 06:56:34 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!metro!news.ci.com.au!eram!dave@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RZeIDc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <1993Nov26.201238.27920@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU>, <rchrw90-291193091103@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a

In article <rchrw90-291193091103@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>, rchrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

| None of which does anything that FIDONET for example didn't do several
| years earlier! Almost all FIDO nodes seem to be running 9600+ baud (most
| 14.4), the nodelist is worldwide etc. All through dialup telephone.

Which in turn pales in comparison with USENET's megabit NNTP feeds...

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU)	VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC	PGP 2.3
dave@esi.COM.AU	...munari!esi.COM.AU!dave	available

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #498
